DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 178 VT 017 927

AUTHOR	Hyatt, Norman F.; Gloriod, John A.
TITLE	Utah Manpower Development and Training Act Skills Center Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	Utah State Board of Education, Salt Lake City.
PUB DATE	Jan 72
NOTE	67p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Disadvantaged Youth; Educational Objectives; Federal Programs; Goal Orientation; Individualized Programs; *Job Training; *Manpower Development; Manpower Utilization; *Performance Criteria; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; Skill Development; Tables (Data); Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Manpower Development and Training Act; *Utah Skills Center

ABSTRACT

This evaluation of 9 months of the first year of the federally funded Utah Manpower Development and Training Act Skills Center with 89 enrollees examines the program's effectiveness by means of a literature review, personnel interviews, preparation of training program objectives, and the utilization of these objectives as success criteria for the program. The data collected generally indicate the need for the existence of the Utah Skills Center. Positive attitudes of the staff help overcome major problems and aid in accomplishing favorable results. It is strongly recommended that the Utah Skills Center be perpetuated. Many aspects of operation need improvement, therefore this report presents a variety of guidelines for developing the Skills Center activities. Numerous appended tables present the results of this program evaluation, including various attitudinal assessment forms and statistical data. (AG)

ED 072178

UTAH MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

SKILLS CENTER EVALUATION

Utah State Board of Education
1972

VT 017927

ED 072178

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UTAH MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

SKILLS CENTER EVALUATION

Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Walter D. Talbot, State Superintendent
Lerue Winget, Deputy Superintendent for Instruction

Division of Research and Innovation
Quentin E. Utley, Administrator
John F. Stephens, Project Director
Norman F. Hyatt and John A. Gloriod,
Principal Investigators

Salt Lake City
January 1972

UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
1400 University Club Building
136 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

Mrs. Helen B. Ure, Chairman
3105 Imperial Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84106

Arthur H. Lee, Vice-Chairman
Bicknell, Utah 84715

Sheldon S. Allred
219 North Carbon Avenue
Price, Utah 84501

Mrs. Erna S. Ericksen
1455 Military Way
Salt Lake City, Utah 84103

Mrs. Esther R. Landa
5006 South 1034 East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84117

A. Reed Morrill
895 North 150 East
Provo, Utah 84601

John L. Owen
1100 South Second West
Wellsville, Utah 84339

N. Russell Tanner
1744 Twenty-fourth Street
Ogden, Utah 84401

Karl I. Truman
Minersville, Utah 84752

Walter D. Talbot, Executive Officer
Salt Lake City, Utah

LaPreal Wight, Secretary
Salt Lake City, Utah

FOREWORD

In December, 1970, the Utah Manpower Planning Council delegated the operation of the Utah Skills Center to the Utah State Board of Education effective January 4, 1971. A VIP program with 89 enrollees, operated by Weber State College in Ogden, was the nucleus of Skills Center North which began operation in April. In Salt Lake, the functions of the Human Resource Center, operated by the Manpower Planning Council, and the WIN high school, operated by Salt Lake City Schools, were allied to form the Salt Lake Skills Center.

One provision of the December agreement was that the State Board of Education would arrange for an outside evaluation of the operation of the Utah Skills Centers. After considerable discussion among representatives of all agencies involved in purchasing or providing services at the Skills Center, an evaluation design was approved. This report is the result of that evaluation and is made available so that the information therein may be utilized to explain and to strengthen the Skills Center Program.

The participation and cooperation of all is appreciated.

Walter D. Talbot
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FOREWORD	iii
INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURES	1
Introduction	1
Procedures	2
RESULTS	4
General Information	4
Qualitative and Quantitative Characteristics	12
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	31
APPENDICES	33
Appendix A	35
Appendix B	37
Appendix C	41
Appendix D	49
Appendix E	55
Appendix F	65

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Employment Status of Selected Graduates	25
2.	Salaries	26
3.	Employers' Assessments of Selected Skills Center Graduates' Performance and Attitude Toward Work by Program, 1971 . .	27
4.	Employers' Assessments of Selected Skills Center Graduates' Performance and Attitude Toward Work, by Classification of Employment, and of High School Complete, Salt Lake City and Skills Center North Combined, 1971	29

UTAH MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT
SKILLS CENTER EVALUATION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The Utah Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) Skills Center officially began operation on January 4, 1971. As stated in the original proposal for a Skills Center in Utah, the program of the Skills Center was planned to be an integration of manpower services consisting of "outreach," testing and evaluation, prevocational orientation and skill preparation, counseling, basic and remedial education, high school completion courses, general education development preparation, job referal and placement, and follow-up.

Initially, it was planned that the operation of the Skills Center be a centralized, self-contained institution under one administration. The first year of operation has seen the fulfillment of the one administration concept but not the single self-contained facility. In the first place, the Utah Skills Center has been established to function in both Salt Lake City and Ogden, a situation which precludes one facility. In the respective communities first concern was to make maximum use of existing facilities in order that the program could be started with minimum costs for facilities. It is planned that eventually in the respective cities of Salt Lake and Ogden, single facilities will be provided in order to better integrate all the services spelled out for the program. In the meantime it is acknowledged that those persons using the Skills Center are able to be served for the most part, at one location within the Center.

Again, as originally proposed, the target population for whom the Skills Center has been established includes those persons who are seriously disadvantaged, culturally, economically and/or educationally, who lack vocational education, and who have a need for social acceptance. Most of the trainees in the program will not have graduated from high school.

This report is of the evaluation of nine months of the first year of the funded program of the Utah MDTA Skills Center operation, recognizing that some components existed prior to becoming a part of the Utah Skills Center while others came under the umbrella at times later than

the outset of initial funding. Reference here is made to the former existence of certain programs under the jurisdiction of the Salt Lake City Board of Education, and Weber State College, both of which have undergone modification to be a part of the Skills Center. The bringing of these programs within the Skills Center was to facilitate the coordination of programs for the target population and to reduce duplication of effort.

The basic problem considered in the report is effectiveness. Have the originally established objectives and goals held for or proposed for the Skills Center been realized? The final answer to this general question may ultimately be in the form of a simple "yes" or a "no," but in the process of deriving such a conclusion, many things being done need to be analyzed. Therefore, the following objectives were prepared for this evaluation effort, the results of which are reported in the balance of this narrative:

1. Conduct a review of related literature.

2. Examine the Manpower Development and Training Act to ascertain the manner in which the provisions of the Act have been accommodated in the Utah Skills Center.

3. With the cooperation and assistance of the Skills Center Director, translate, where necessary, the Center's objectives into measurable terms and decide upon method and calendar for the evaluative processes.

4. Develop, devise, or otherwise identify success criteria which will provide an indication of the effectiveness of the program at the Skills Center.

5. Conduct the activities of (a) data collection employing the instruments and techniques developed and agreed upon as being appropriate for that purpose, (b) data analysis and interpretation, and (c) reporting the findings.

Procedures

The review of the related literature and research was conducted principally in April and May, 1971. A literature search of ERIC was conducted and reports of previous activities in Utah and selected other states were reviewed. The annotated bibliography presented as Appendix A contains the brief report of the literature and research reviewed.

The guidelines prepared by the U. S. Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, June, 1970, for the establishment of Skills Centers were reviewed in order to establish the basis for comparison of the observed manner in which the Utah Skills

Center began and functioned during the first three calendar quarters of 1971. The cut-off date of September 30, 1971, was determined to be appropriate as it represented the end point of a period of time when data could be acquired and reported upon in order to incorporate the results of the evaluation in the application for continuation of the Skills Center. Data were collected throughout the term of the evaluation contract according to the original general plans as well as according to modifications of the plans agreed upon by the Director of the Skills Center, the Director of the Utah Research Coordinating Unit and the evaluators. It is noted that representatives of the respective agencies and institutions met on several occasions to be briefed on plans for evaluation, to be involved in modifying those plans where appropriate, and to hear and consider tentative conclusions reached during preparation of a preliminary report of the evaluation. Following each such review session, plans and reports including the modifications to the data gathering instruments, reflected the considerations of the groups who had reviewed the progress of the evaluation as of the respective meetings.

The comparison between the provisions of the guidelines and the manner in which those provisions have been met in the Utah Skills Center are reported in the section entitled General Information.

It should be noted further, that much time during the early part of the evaluation contract period was devoted to assisting personnel in the Skills Center in the preparation of the objectives for the Center and developing the instruments to be used in the gathering of the data. Meetings were held with Center personnel orienting them to the process of establishing objectives. Many measurable objectives for the respective components of the Center were written, refined and agreed upon as being the guidelines for operation and the basis for evaluation. In addition, teachers individually developed performance objectives for their classes and subject matter areas, thus implementing the ideas proferred in the training sessions. Again, members of the total evaluation team participated in the orientation meetings as consultants in formulation of the objectives but not in the establishment of objectives for the Center personnel or the Center itself. The objectives thus developed by Center personnel and around which the evaluative instruments were prepared are contained as Appendix B.

Several planning sessions for instrument preparation were held by the evaluators and the Center staffs. Thus, the forms ultimately used were mutually agreed to be those appropriate for evaluative purposes. Some of the data were provided directly by Center personnel from the files of the Center. The confidential nature of these files was maintained throughout the evaluation and the Center staff was very cooperative in providing assistance. Copies of the instruments used in the collection of these kinds of data are presented as Appendix C. The report of the data derived from the use of the instruments is presented under the heading of Quantitative and Qualitative Characteristics contained in the body of the report. A section of General Conclusions and Recommendations is the final section of the report.

In reporting the evaluation of the first phases of the operation of Utah's Skill Center, it should also be pointed out that the guidelines for operation were not available until after the establishment of the data base and data were nearly all collected.

RESULTS

General Information

A primary objective of the Skills Center evaluation was that of examining the Manpower Development and Training Act to ascertain the manner in which the provisions of the act have been accomodated in the Utah Skills Center. This section of the evaluation report contains the comparison of the conditions or requirements described in detail in the guidelines along with the observed manner in which the guidelines have been followed or adhered to at the respective locations of the Utah Skills Center, the WIN High School,* the Hamilton Center in Salt Lake City and the Skills Center North in Ogden. In the left-hand column of the material presented below are to be found the guideline statements as brief resumes, while in the right-hand column are to be found statements citing the manner of compliance with the guidelines. In some instances the compliance statements are based on direct observations of conditions, others on statements rendered by Center personnel. Conclusion statements are interspersed throughout and are based on observations made by the evaluators. The material is presented under two divisions entitled Duties of Skills Center Staff and Responsibilities of Employment Service.

The guidelines state:

> The MDTA guidelines are to be used by State and Regional Office Labor and Education staffs in the development and planning of Skills Centers funded primarily under the Manpower Development and Training Act. They are to be followed: (a) as a basis for determining whether a Skills Center is necessary; (b) to determine where it should be located and the area and population it should serve; (c) to review on an annual basis presently designated Skills Centers to determine their effectiveness and their conformity to established criteria; and (d) as a basis for establishing priority in the use of the Skills Centers in the CAMPS (Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System) planning process.

During conversations with Center personnel it was concluded that the (a) and (b) portions of the above statement from the guidelines did receive adequate and due consideration during the preparation of the initial proposal for operation. The need exists and the satisfaction of the need, at least initially, was to be through the established Skills Center operations in Salt Lake City and Ogden, Utah. The following assessment pertains primarily to part (c) of the above statement from the guidelines.

---

*WIN High School. Work Incentive program high school administered by Salt Lake City School District for completion by adults of requirements for the high school diploma. WIN students began participation in the Skills Center program July 1971.

Duties of skills center staff.

MDTA Requirement	Skills Center Compliance
Center must be a separately identifiable entity with a separate management structure to insure the standards and priorities of the MDTA program are maintained. The Center must have a full-time professional and clerical staff capable of providing the training and services needed. The Director will oversee and direct all aspects of the operations and coordinate the efforts of the entire staff, both Education and Employment Service. (IV-H)	Both Salt Lake City locations and Skills Center North satisfy the requirement for being a separate entity. The WIN school could satisfy the requirement of being a satellite, however, the director would have to report to the Director of Salt Lake City Skills Center instead of reporting to the Salt Lake City Board of Education. Salt Lake City Skills Center has sufficient teachers and instructors to provide minimal training. However, many courses, such as basic education, automotive courses, and welding would benefit from teacher's aides. Any additional courses would require additional teachers. The staff does not have the capability of providing all of the needed services, child care, transportation, etc., in order to fully comply with MDTA guidelines. In Salt Lake City counseling services have been provided in cooperation with Employment Security. The Manpower specialist has served in this capacity. Skills Center North is presently short of teachers in some areas, and could readily use more teacher's aides (coaches). The clerical staff is large enough but should be under an assistant director of administration in order to free the director from the details of that level of management. The director, Mr. Mukai, is a person who has the necessary "feel" for the "clients" of the Center and as such fulfills the need of relating to them in a positive way. In some instances, this may be at the expense of fulfilling some administrative functions, thus, providing the basis for the conclusion that an administrative assistant is needed at the Skills Center North.

Employment Service staff at the Skills Center North consists of one person assigned full-time. A change in personnel manning the position took place on or about October 1, 1971. It was further explained by Center personnel that WIN funds have paid part of the costs of the services of the Employment Service person at the Skills Center North. It is suggested that those responsible for supplying the services, as well as those who use them be in agreement regarding the types of services to be performed, the responsible agency or person, and the sources of financial support, thereof, in order to properly account for the services that actually are performed.

The WIN School also needs teacher's aides, especially in the Adult Basic classes, according to teachers. Here, too, additional courses would require additional teachers. The work load of the director, Mr. Archuletta, points up the need for an administrative assistant.

The Employment Service staff at the WIN School consists of scheduled visits by WIN agency counselors.

Provide a variety of occupational offerings during prime time, suitable to both male and female trainees. Three clusters with at least three occupational offerings per cluster must be offered.

Both Skills Centers could be considered to satisfy these requirements.

The WIN School in this regard can only be considered a satellite.

As initially proposed, a difference in the definition of what constitutes a cluster exists between the Salt Lake City Center, and the Skills Center North. At Salt Lake City, persons preparing for specific jobs are classified as being in a given cluster, whereas at Skills Center North, persons in a cluster by the same name are preparing for entirely different jobs, even different levels of jobs.

Each cluster must permit skill progression. When feasible, of course, offerings should be clustered according to related occupations to provide maximum adjustment to individual abilities and potential.	This is being accomplished with a degree of success at Skills Center North where some students who are unable to satisfactorily complete the entire courses are spun-off at lower levels of skill or are directed into a related vocation of lesser skill level. (This will be discussed under "counseling" for Salt Lake City Skills Center a and WIN School.)
Centers must have sufficient flexibility to meet shifts in employment demand and unexpected need.	This is a judgement factor and only by an expansion of facilities could Salt Lake City Skills Center meet an unexpected need. Skills Center North could meet reasonable additional needs by expanding the use of Weber State College facilities. The WIN School could for its courses expand a small amount with additional teachers.
Centers will provide full-time training for disadvantaged. Fifty percent of the trainees should be heads of households.	All facilities provide full-time training. Salt Lake City Skills Center has 56 percent of married, divorced, and widowed students. WIN School also reported 56 percent of its students as married, divorced or widowed. Salt Lake City Skills Center students were all unemployed and 34 percent were on welfare. WIN School students were unemployed when enrolled and were all welfare recipients.
Skills Centers will provide: basic education, communication skills, GED training where necessary, and bilingual and/ or second language where needed.	Salt Lake City Skills Center provides these courses, with the exception of English as a second language, which the teachers consider a necessity for part of the Center population. This void is also at the WIN School. Skills Center North provides all of these requirements.

Presently the Salt Lake City Skills Center and the WIN High School graduates can earn high school diplomas through the Salt Lake City Board of Education. Negotiations are expected to be complete by October 31, 1971, whereby Skills Center North graduates will be able to earn high school diplomas through the Weber County School District.

The educational program should include both individual and group counseling. Personal counseling is to assist trainees with non-vocational problems which could affect their learning ability and future adjustment to work and society. It should be concerned with the following: testing and assessment, motivational and attitudinal counseling, individual employability plan counseling input, and personal and socio-economic problem counseling. Serious psychological and psychiatric problems must be referred to competent agencies. All counseling will involve planned coordination with Employment Service counseling staff and should permit full exchange of testing and counseling results between staffs.

A plan of coordinated counseling appears to be the most neglected requirement in all of the Skills Centers. There also appears to be little or no coordination in the sense spelled out by National Agencies for MDTA Skills Centers. Of the three counselors in Salt Lake City Skills Center only one indicated that some cooperation was in evidence concerning terminating students. Few teachers report that they have ever seen a counselor much less participate in making an individual's employability plan in the sense that was initially intended.

Concept of employability plan being developed for each trainee is an outline of a training plan including goals and time line and evaluation of activities to assist in his personal adjustment, motivation and preparation for placement in the labor market. It is suggested that the present form being used for employment plans be examined to ascertain if it details sufficiently the specific goals.

Some counselors are not sure of their exact objectives. In some cases counselors have been instructed not to counsel Neighborhood Youth Corp students even if the students come to them. Both counselors and teachers expressed a great need for psychological

	counseling, particularly for the younger students. Further psychological counseling should be available at the school. If the "buy in" agencies do not want the services of Skills Center counselors, they should then participate with the Employment Service staff in providing their own counseling at the Center.
Dropout rate: no more than 35 percent dropout average per year. Occupations with more than 35 percent dropout rate should be checked before recycling.	Salt Lake City Skills Center had a dropout rate of 49.4 percent according to enrollment data provided. WIN School had a dropout rate of 13 percent. Skills Center North had a rate of 41.5 percent.
Placement: At least 75 percent must be placed in jobs; 60 percent training related or if not training related comparable level, meaning "an effective placement."	Most WIN graduates continued in post secondary schools. Of the sixteen graduates seeking jobs 93 percent, or fifteen, were placed. Skills Center North placed 100 percent of their graduates, 96 percent in related fields. In the Salt Lake City Skills Center of the 122 graduates eighty-nine sought employment. Sixty-five of the eighty-nine, 73 percent, were placed. Fifty-one, 79 percent, of the sixty-five who were placed, were in training related jobs.
To increase program flexibility and operational efficiency, the open-ended concept, whereby training slots are kept filled and utilized during the entire period, should be incorporated into the basic plan.	This open-ended concept is adhered to at all Center locations. Students are accepted as soon as they report to the Centers. There is no waiting before starting classes after registration is complete.

Centers must have an organized method to permit "buy in" by other programs including a per trainee fee based on the type trainee to be served, training and services required, utilities, etc.	The "buy in" is being accomplished but the extent of the directions for the organized method for determining costs was not observed.
A formal program of employment orientation derived from the occupational offerings of the Center should be integrated into the overall program. This should be a coordinated activity involving both Educational and Employment Service personnel.	(See Discussion below on the Responsibilities of Employment Service.)

Responsibilities of employment service.

Employment Service functions should be performed by a qualified staff stationed at the Center on a full-time basis unless these centers are considered "small." Representatives of the Employment Service should be present at least on a part-time basis to deal with difficulties relating to allowance payments.	An initial observation might be that these requirements are not being met in the manner prescribed in the MDTA guidelines. However, a difference in opinion exists between personnel of the Center themselves, as well as between those persons and the evaluators, with respect to what the guidelines say and "what is." This was evidenced in different oral communications and suggests that additional clarifying and orienting sessions be held in order to reduce confusion and enhance harmony for continued operation of the Skills Center.
The Employment Service staff at the Center should work closely with the Educational staff to facilitate changes in the program to enhance placement opportunities by making courses relevant to employer needs.	It was noted that each of the respective components of the Utah Skills Center enrolled some persons directly and not through the referral agencies.
Each Center must have the capability for direct enrollment at the Skills Center.	
Employment Service must provide a comprehensive job counseling program, including testing, appraisal and occupational analysis.	It was also observed that testing and some vocational counseling prior to enrollment was acknowledged by teachers and Center counselors. However, many students interviewed did not know their counselor.

Employment Service staff will be full participants in the trainee support team working with educational personnel to develop individualized training and service plans for each trainee.

An employability plan, enrolling a student in a particular course, accompanies each student referred to the Skills Center. The form presently being used should be examined to ascertain if it details sufficiently the specific training goals for each student, a means of determining when the goals are reached, and a time table to be followed. A revised plan, plus arranging consultation time for Employment Service and educational personnel, would be one way to develop individualized training and service plans for each trainee.

Employment Service must provide a full range of job development and placement activities, including job solicitation, job restructuring, etc. Skill Center instructors are of valuable assistance in this function which should be coordinated by Employment Service to avoid duplication and to insure that all placements are recorded.

The Employment Service, in coordination with the Skills Center staffs, must develop a follow-up system which will meet performance standards. (Appendix III-H of MDTA instructions) The Educational staff, because of personal contacts with both trainees and employers, should work jointly in this effort with the Employment Service to maximize effectiveness. Services should include continuing placement efforts, supportive counseling after placement to assist in adjustment, and arrangements with other agencies to continue their services to former trainees as necessary.

These are the very things that the great majority of teacher recommended as changes to be made which also would ultimately comply with the guidelines. The vocational instructors felt these services in follow-up were a prime necessity to "save" many of the trainees that would otherwise fail in adjusting to the work world and difficulties encountered on the job. They cited instances of being called to the phone to help former students long after they were placed on jobs.

It should be noted that if all of these conditions and services are fulfilled there will be a requirement for a considerable increase in the staffs of the Centers and an increase or relocation of the Employment Service personnel.

This study did not examine the job development, job solicitation or follow-up activities of the Employment Service. (A supplemental report is designed to perform this task.) Placement results indicate that these services are being performed. One critical point is that the results of these activities are not being communicated to educational

personnel. Means of coordinating the activities of the Employment Service and the educational personnel should be developed.

Qualitative and Quantitative Characteristics

The report presented in this section of the total evaluation of the Utah Skills Center is of data acquired through interviews of personnel at all levels, students as individuals and in groups such as student councils, teachers, counselors, administrators, and members of the advisory councils or policy boards. An interview guide was prepared and used in order that common elements of operation could be reviewed. In addition to oral responses, evaluation of the Center was made by having personnel complete questionnaires designed to assess attitudes toward the Center's operation and relationship between the importance and effectiveness of the objectives developed for the Center.

As one reads the reports of the interviews and the reports of the other forms of the evaluation he might be inclined to conclude that there are discrepancies between the two. If in fact there are, these should be considered in the light in which they are presented, i.e., data from two different vantage points sometimes provide evidences of differences. In other instances, generalizations appear in one form and specifics or quantifications appear in the other form. In either event, discrepancies or not, whichever may be the case in this report, the data presented herein are as acquired during the evaluation process and presented without extensive explanations or estimations of the reasons for whatever differences there may be.

One other point should be kept in mind. This report is of three different types of operations each of which is intended to be within the same set of guidelines. Differing applications of certain elements of the guidelines may produce different results as well as different reactions. Again, in neither event ought these differences be interpreted as being <u>good</u> in one case and <u>bad</u> in the other. More appropriately, the differences might be interpreted as fulfilling the need for individuality. They might also be considered as being the conditions or situations needing modification, as plans and the implementation thereof, are made for the continuation of the operation of the Center. The business of maximizing the numerous assets identified throughout the report and polishing the rough spots where found leads to the conclusion that the evaluation is intended to render a service to the Center and not merely be the identification of what is good and what is not.

Development of program and course objectives. As was mentioned earlier, during the first phase of the overall evaluation period, considerable time was devoted to participating with the Skills Centers staffs in formulating Center objectives and measurable behavioral objectives for the individual courses taught in the Centers. There was initially some individual reluctance to accept the need for developing course objectives by teachers. However objectives were developed for all courses.

During interviews it was determined that practically all teachers were using the objectives they had developed. They have accepted these objectives as aids in the conduct of the open-ended classes and as feedbacks on student comprehension. Most feel that the objectives help them in maintaining direction for the individualization of instruction and as means of determining a student's satisfactory completion of the course.

The course objectives were also to be imparted to the student at the start of the course as a guide and goal. The students interviewed seldom understood the objectives and their use. Some students were exceptions, as business and welding had very definite objectives for completion. The teachers explained that students "just would not read the objectives given to them if they were over a page long."

The general consensus of the teachers was that the measurable objectives were of value in the open-ended instruction.

Student problems. Students and teachers alike agree that the poor attendance records in all centers can be directly attributed to the problems of the students. These are of every sort and description. Divorce in the family is a main contributor and is reflected in a variety of ways: children of divorced parents who have turned away from society; young mothers who have married early and have dropped out of school and then been divorced or abandoned with small children; older women who have obtained divorces from husbands who have not supported them and their children. Of the women students it is estimated that 90 percent are divorced, or have had children without marriage. Drugs and alcoholism also account for some of the problems of both men and women. The teachers contend that the students addicted do not cause trouble as "they have more respect for us than to come to school when under the influence" - they just stay away.

Transportation and child care also contribute to the absenteeism. The stipends received for attending school are insufficient to permit the students to maintain cars in good running condition; as a result they often miss classes because of breakdowns. A definite problem concerning student owned transportation is lack of insurance. Few, if any, of the welfare students carry liability insurance, and with Utah traffic accident incident rate this could be a problem. Some type of group insurance would be a benefit. The issue is being worked on by both students and the Advisory Council.

Even with good child care, students-parents are faced with the problem of sick children who are not permitted in day care centers or who must be taken to the medical facilities during school hours.

There are also many physical and mental problems that deter the students from attending. Many times they just don't feel like attending and see no reason why they should. Some just haven't been motivated.

Recommended changes--center personnel. Practically all of the teachers agreed that they do not mind the heavy schedule of classes (six of seven class periods). They consider that they would do a better job in the long run if they had longer periods off. They understand the need for continuous school for the MDTA students, but think it would be better for other students if they could have short breaks in their schedule. The teachers would also appreciate short breaks during the year. Attendance records indicate that many students take short breaks on their own even though this seldom applied to MDTA students. Some teachers suggested that one afternoon a week be devoted to workshops, seminars, discussions of mutual problems. etc. This would permit the teachers to confer with the resident counselors concerning employment plans and student progress as envisaged in the MDTA guidelines. While this would necessitate letting the students off for the afternoon, it would permit free time for students to take care of personal problems that now interfere with their attendance; food stamps, family services, medical and dental appointments.

Many teachers expressed a need for teachers' aides. With the student load and the need for individualized instruction, many times the teacher is forced to neglect some students when devoting time to someone who is having difficulties with the subject. This is most noticeable in Adult Basic Education, where most of the students have had little if any previous education. There is also a need in some of the vocational courses where the classes sometimes reach fifteen to twenty-five students.

The change recommended most often by the teachers and counselors was a desire for better organization of the Skills Center. This was expressed as being needed from "top to bottom" in some cases. The teacher objected to "too many bosses" whether at the local level or agency level. There were many "sets of rules" to respond to. The various referral agencies all have different objectives and different requirements for their students. This places a heavy administrative load on the teachers to maintain the required records on each individual student. They also feel that the objectives of the referral agencies are not compatible with those of the Centers. Many students are referred to the Centers who are manifestly unable to succeed in the program to which they are assigned by their agency. This would be obviated by compliance with MDTA guidelines concerning employment plans. The teachers feel that to be able to obtain and hold a job, students must be able to read, speak English, and have a related knowledge of math. They also consider that too much emphasis is placed on "getting people on the job." While this is the primary object of the program, many times the student

will be able to perform on the job at hand yet be unable to adapt to changes that occur in the job because of a lack of sufficient background knowledge. It is reasonable that there should be compatibility between the objectives if the Centers are to be successful.

Teachers in the Salt Lake City Center are unsure of just where they stand. They cite the fact that they are not sure for whom they work. Some are paid by the Salt Lake City School Board, others by UTEC.* (This is not in strict compliance with MDTA guidelines.) They do not have a set of standards concerning their salaries, the future of their positions, chances for advancement and raises, and do not have any fringe benefits normally associated with teaching. They all expressed that these conditions did not in any way make them wish to leave the Center but that it was demoralizing. This condition does not exist at Skills Center North as they all work for Weber State College. A solution that would possibly satisfy the teachers' misgivings would be to follow the MDTA guidelines more closely. Subsequent to the gathering of data at the Salt Lake Skills Center (Hamilton, UTEC Downtown, and WIN Schools) it was learned that WIN teachers had been informed of their position with respect to other public school teachers, and plans were underway to discuss the positions of the Hamilton and UTEC teachers in the near future.

Strengths. Without exception the faculty consider the acceptance of all students referred to the Centers at any time to be the most important characteristic of the whole program. They believe everyone should have the opportunity to prove themselves. However, some consider this is also a weakness, as the teachers are not able to terminate those who are not able to complete their assigned program. This detracts from the time teachers would be able to devote to those who are making satisfactory progress. Some estimated that the Center would greatly increase the percentage of successful completions if this were permitted.

Some rearrangement of programs is being accomplished at Skills Center North where they are able to take advantage of the flexibility of courses in Weber State College; i.e., business students are transferred to the cashier course when unable to cope with the business program.

The individual instruction and the fact that the students can proceed at their own pace is a great asset. This permits the slower students to remain in the program without feeling inferior because they are not keeping pace with others. This instills confidence in many students that never before had faith in themselves. The slow are able to feel success and its rewards. An added factor is the strong rapport that is built-up between teachers and students, both of whom expressed the strong bonds they had. Students feel that their teachers are some of the first people that have ever been interested in them.

---

*UTEC. Utah Technical College, Salt Lake City, Utah.

The evaluation disclosed that probably the greatest strength is the complete dedication of the staffs and faculties of the Centers. All are enthusiastic about their work and they have a feeling of personal satisfaction of accomplishment. Many teachers stated that they could never go back to teaching in a regular school.

Weaknesses. The greatest detriment to faster completion by most of the students is poor attendance. Overall attendance is approximately 60 percent. Some courses and most vocational classes have higher attendance. MDTA students, as a general rule, attend more than others. As presently staffed there isn't much the Center personnel can do about the outside problems of the students which in a large measure contribute to the poor attendance. Here again, however, stricter compliance with the MDTA guidelines would help alleviate this condition through the work of the mobile counselors as envisaged in the Skills Center North original proposal.

Many classes are handicapped by a lack of texts, equipment and facilities. In some cases this is due to students taking the books home and failing to return them. In other cases it is due to the long process of requisitioning from the institution under whose auspices the Center operates. In the Salt Lake City Skills Center business machines are in short supply for the number of enrollees. Only the poor attendance makes it possible to accommodate all of the students present. This would prevent any large degree of expansion.

It was reported that the amount of paper work involved in satisfying the requirements of the referral agencies concerning attendance takes as much as ten minutes per hour. This obviously seriously cuts down the amount of time for individual instruction. Everyone accepts the necessity for taking attendance, but deplores the amount of time it and other record keeping takes. The consensus is that a solution must be found but no good solution was offered.

Specific additional programs. While the students expressed a need for more elective courses in the high school and GED programs, some of the teachers remarked that in the past, sign-up lists for proposed electives did not produce enough prospective students to justify the classes, with the exception of physical education. The suggested subjects covered a wide range and were directly associated with the students' own interests: dance, dramatics, arts and crafts, mechanical drawing (WIN and Salt Lake City), and more physical education.

Many of the teachers were of the opinion that the vocational subjects taught were not necessarily compatible with the local job markets. They also consider that many of the students referred to some of the more technical courses are not able to complete the course sufficiently well to obtain and maintain a job. They stress the amount of

time required for special instruction to teach these students a sufficient amount of English, reading and math needed in these subjects. They are of the opinion that students should be channelled into vocations of a lesser degree of skill, waitress, housekeeping for institutions, nurses' aides, janitorial duties, power sewing machines, etc. Some of this is being accomplished at Skills Center North.

The teacher conducting the newly established Food Service course at Salt Lake City Skills Center is highly optimistic about the prospects for employment for his students. He is assisted by an advisory council of related agencies and institutions in the community, and most institutions have expressed a willingness to hire the graduates. The course is presently for one year and an additional year is recommended for a more comprehensive career pattern. This could be either at Salt Lake City Skills Center or UTEC. In this regard the instructors of auto-body and diesel mechanics courses also recommend additional time.

There is a need in the business courses for "Practice Offices" where students nearing graduation could "get the feel" of what they could expect on the job. The teachers feel that this would "save" a few more in the work world. At present the teachers receive phone calls for help from the recently hired graduates who are confronted with business procedures with which they were unfamiliar or which had not been taught in the course. They also feel that it is essential that teachers follow-up their students on the job. This is being done to some extent by the teachers of the Skills Center North with their own transportation and time.

Comments. A small minority of the teachers at Salt Lake City Skills Center thought there was some friction between the staff and faculty. This is in part due to the certification of some teachers and not others. The lack of a standard pay scale also might have something to do with this. The director of the Salt Lake City Skills Center confirmed that there was some complaint in this regard, but that he had hired only two teachers since he took over the Center and that both were certified. Little evidence of friction was observed during the evaluation and it apparently is not evident to the students.

All concerned considered that the Skills Center image must be improved. Publicity should be given to the work being done at the Center. The lack of public knowledge concerning the operations detract from the value of the certificates issued by the Centers. Instances were reported of prospective employers ridiculing the certificates. Effort should be made to relate the Skills Center to the sponsoring institutions - UTEC and Weber State. This image needs to be improved not only with the public but the students as well. Proper signs proclaiming the nature of the facilities should be erected over the old names of the facilities used. The greatest means of creating the image will be the success of the graduates and they should be motivated in this regard prior to going on the job.

By far the greatest amount of comment during the interviews concerned counseling. No further discussion of this problem will be made as it is covered in the section on the degree of compliance with MDTA guidelines. Strict compliance with the guidelines on this subject would obviate most, if not all, of the dissatisfactions of the staffs and faculties.

Student governments. The student government organization at WIN school was very impressive. The students were articulate, realistic, sensible, and enthusiastic about their participation. They had confidence in their ability to work between the students and the administration, and reported that the matters brought before the staff and faculty were well received and justly acted upon. They reported back to the studentbody during assemblies.

The student governments (councils) at Skills Center North and the Hamilton-UTEC Downtown facilities of Salt Lake City Skills Center are not well organized at this time. The former is in the process of organization under the recently adopted constitution and the representatives of the council reported that they had high hopes for success in bringing the students into active participation in the Center. The Salt Lake City Skills Center student government has been operating for some time and the addition of other facilities and agencies necessitated the adoption of a new constitution. Reorganization under this new constitution is proceeding under the personal direction of the Director.

Attitudinal assessments. Assessments of the attitudes of persons connected with the Skills Center were made in two different ways. In the first instance, fifteen different situations or positions were presented for reaction. They ranged from "The physical facilities are adequate" to "If I had to do it again, I would choose to be part of the Skills Center Program." Four possible responses were made available: agree, partially agree, no opinion, and disagree. The complete report of the responses of personnel at the three locations of the Center is presented as Appendix E. Only highlights are contained in this section of the report.

A simple formula for determining the significance of difference between means was employed to relate attitudes of one group with other possible combinations. It should be noted that where significance was noted it was considered at the .05 level of confidence. (The formula used accommodates small N's, a situation encountered even when groups of respondents of similar position were combined to increase the N. Therefore, caution should be taken in the interpretation of the significance of the results.)

1. Mixed feelings, in some cases being significantly different from one location to the others as well as between the personnel of a given location, were registered regarding the adequacy of the physical facilities.

2. Students at both the WIN and the Skills Center North feel the student-teacher ratio is too large. At the Hamilton the converse is held, even though the differences in attitudes between students and staff are not significant.

3. Even though criticism of the counseling services being provided in the Skills Center was registered previously in this evaluation report, when reacting to the statement, "The counseling services are satisfactory," agreement or partial agreement was rendered in each of the nine instances by the staffs, students, and referral agencies or policy boards at each location. In each case the students registered greater satisfaction regarding the counseling services than did the staffs, significantly so at the Hamilton and the Skills Center North but not at WIN.

4. There was quite general disagreement concerning the time in the Skills Center assignment being a waste of time. Personnel felt they were not wasting their time at all levels.

5. Students and staff at the WIN and Hamilton locations expressed concern over the adequacy of the books and materials. At the Skills Center North there was a more positive feeling toward the books and materials being adequate.

6. General agreement was registered for the statement, "The course offerings of the Skills Center are appropriate." The least agreement, while still being stated as partial agreement, was noted at the Skills Center North.

7. General compatability among staff members was evidenced, the staffs of the locations reporting stronger agreement to the issue of compatability than the students, but the difference did not show up as being significant.

8. Few respondents to the attitudinal assessment consider that affiliating with the Skills Center was a mistake. All personnel connected with the Skills Center consider the program of the Center to be a success even if in varying degrees.

9. There was only "partial agreement" on the part of Skills Center personnel in response to the statement, "Students trained at the Skills Center are well enough prepared to acquire and hold jobs."

10. The strongest agreement to any statement was recorded for the one dealing with repeating affiliation with the Skills Center if given the chance to do it again. In all instances, all persons at all three locations, strong agreement was recorded for this contingency.

Importance and effectiveness of objectives. The other aspect of attitudinal assessment was concerned with relating assessments of importance of the objectives to the effectiveness of them as perceived by the respective groups of persons associated with the Skills Center. In one sense the reactions to effectiveness can be considered an evaluation of the Center on the part of all connected with it, a sort of self-evaluation of the program and operation of the Center. In each instance where there was a difference between the assessment of the importance of the objective and its effectiveness, the importance was rated higher than the effectiveness. Here as was the case in the other attitudinal assessment, a simple formula for determining the significance of differences between means was used. The detailed data concerning importance and effectiveness of Center objectives are presented in the Appendix as Table 10. Only highlights are brought forth to the body of the report.

1. The difference between the importance and effectiveness of the objective of accepting all referrals was not significant except as perceived by the referral agencies and policy boards. The staffs at the respective locations felt there was no difference, at the .05 level of confidence, between the importance and effectiveness of this objective. The objective was being met. But the Advisory groups and the Policy Board of the Skills Center North did not perceive this matter in the same fashion. This condition, as well as some of the others reported below, suggests that there is need for improved communication between the personnel operating the Centers and those others involved somewhat less directly.

2. There was general agreement that all the courses at the Skills Center ought to be open-ended. At the same time, there was general agreement that this objective was being realized near the level of importance registered for it.

3. With respect to the objective that 75 percent of the students referred to the Center will successfully complete their program, the staffs at the WIN High School and the Hamilton Center both indicate that there is no difference between the importance and the effectiveness of it. In each instance there was moderate to high importance and effectiveness accorded the objective. Such was not the case on the part of the staff at the Skills Center North and each of the three advisory or policy groups or referral agencies. Even though these four groups of respondents considered the objective to be an important one, there was a significant difference between the importance

and its effectiveness. The quantitative data reported earlier bears this out, i.e., less than 75 percent of those persons referred to the Center actually completed their programs.

4. The staffs of the Center locations consider that the objective of, "50 percent of the successful trainees will acquire permanent employment," is important and has been effective. The objective has been met. The advisory and policy groups and the referral agencies hold the position that the objective is important but it is not being met. Here again, the difference in perception of the effectiveness of the objective might be attributed to the communication problem.

5. One objective was stated, "Improve skills by at least three grades (if ninth grade or lower) and pass a test showing this improvement within six months." All persons connected with the Skill Center considered the objective to be important but here, too, the advisory groups and policy boards and referral agencies at the Hamilton and the Skills Center North considered that its effectiveness was at a level significantly below its importance.

6. Taking and passing the GED test was considered by all as being an important objective as well as one that was being met at a level comparable to its importance. The same situation prevailed with respect to the objective for students in the Center of passing a screening test for selection into skill training with a minimum score of 70 percent.

As indicated at the outset of this discussion of attitudes toward the Skills Center and the relationship between the importance and the effectiveness of the objectives, a complete examination of the data acquired during the evaluation is possible by turning to the Appendix where the tables containing the data are presented.

Other quantifying information. During the planning for the evaluation team determined that Center personnel at each location, insofar as possible, would supply some twenty-two different kinds of quantitative data depicting a profile of the operation of the Center. Tables 1 through 8 presented as Appendix D contain the data for the respective components of the Utah Skills Center for the period from January through September, 1971. Highlights of the characteristics of the Center include:

1. A total of 843 persons, 475 male and 368 female, were referred to the separate locations of the Center, ALL of whom were accepted into one program or another. The largest number of referrals was made through WIN, a total of 181 males and 175 females. No referrals were made either from the Community Action or Bureau of Indian Affairs during this nine month period. The largest enrollment was at the Hamilton location where a total of 415 persons were accepted into the program.

2. Data for 707 persons regarding the last grade attended were reported. Of this total, enrollees at the Utah Skills Center numbered 113 who had graduated from high school, eighty-nine who had completed only the eleventh grade, 203 the tenth, 147 the ninth, and 155 who had completed the eighth grade or less.

3. The age group containing the largest number of enrolless in the Skills Center was that of twenty years and under. Sixteen year olds numbered thirty-two (32), seventeen -- eighty (80), eighteen -- eighty-six (86), nineteen -- fifty-three (53), and twenty -- fifty-four (54), for a total in this age group of 305. There were 205 persons in the 21-25 age group and 154 others thirty or less years of age. Together these age groups accounted for all but 179 of the grand total of enrollees.

4. Two of the three locations reported data pertaining to the marital, employment, and welfare status of the enrollees. Thus, meaningful totals representing the total Center were not derived and are not reported with respect to these characteristics. At the same time seventy-nine of the enrollees were veterans, four were Job Corps graduates, and thirty were reported as having some form of physical disability.

5. The racial origin of 699 was reported by Center personnel. Four hundred seventy-one were white, thirty -- Negro, 184 -- Spanish-American, seven -- Indian, three -- Oriental, and four of other races.

6. A total of seventy-two persons who enrolled in one of the Skills Center locations did not remain longer than one month. These persons were not counted as students at the Center. In addition, thirty-eight WIN students were reported as having discontinued the programs prior to their completion. This thirty-eight coupled with the twenty-two WIN enrollees who dropped out in less than a month total sixty, 43 percent, of the initially enrolled. Comparable data for the other locations were not reported by Center personnel.

7. Thirty-one full-time teachers man the teaching positions at the Center. The mean age of the teachers, aside from the Skills Center North, is approximately thirty-five (35). The administrators are slightly younger. The mean number of years of teaching experience for the teachers was approximately eight years while for administrators it was approximately five and one-half. White, Negro, Spanish-American, and Oriental teachers, counselors, and administrators man the staffs of the Center. White staff members account for 73 percent of the total, Negro and Oriental members for about 4 1/2 percent each, and Spanish-American about 17 1/2 percent.

In addition to the data reported in table form, other aspects of quantifiable data were sought and reported in differing amounts from the respective locations of the Utah Skills Center. The remainder of this section of the report contains summary statements pertaining to these kinds of data.

1. No delays between acceptance and starting of training programs was reported from any of the three Center locations.

2. Criteria used to determine whether or not a person had completed his program included graduation employability, proficiency of skills in vocational areas being acquired, whether or not the student

had met the objectives for the individual classes, and the completion of the work prescribed by the teacher.

3. Estimates of the amount of counseling time provided were recorded for the Hamilton location and the Skills Center North. One hundred seventy-three distributive education students were provided an average of forty-two minutes; ninety in office occupations an average of seventy minutes; fourteen in health occupations an average of 180 minutes; sixteen food service students an average of twenty-five minutes; and fifty-six in trade and industrial an average of sixty minutes. No other estimates of counseling services were formally reported.

4. The average direct instructional cost of training per student at WIN was reported as $491 for the first 7-1/2 months, or at the rate of $785 per year, and at a rate of $690 at Skills Center North. A cost of $677 for the first six months of operation of the Salt Lake Skills Center was reported by the Skills Center Director. Parallel data for all segments of the total operation were not available as they did not all start at the same time.

5. In-service training was provided the staffs of the respective locations, ten hours at WIN, twenty-five hours at Hamilton, and forty hours at Skills Center North.

6. Student government organization was reported as functioning at all locations but only the WIN High School was observed as having an organization.

7. Regular attendance was impeded at the respective Center locations because of partially or wholely inadequate transportation, baby care assistance, stipends to students, home counseling, home economics advice, budgeting advice, and health care.

Followup. During the process of conducting the general evaluation of the Utah Skills Center it was decided that an assessment of the success of the graduates of the Center in obtaining and holding employment was necessary in order to make the evaluation complete. The evaluation team consequently was contracted to make the requisite followup study by surveying and interviewing employers of a number of graduates as well as some of the graduates themselves. The total number of graduates to be included in the followup was not to exceed fifty.

Names of employed graduates on record with their original sponsoring agencies were obtained and fifty were randomly selected for the followup survey. There were forty graduates from the Salt Lake City area and ten from the Skills Center North (Ogden) area. This was the approximate distribution of employed graduates furnished by the agencies. (See Table 1, "Employment Status of Selected Graduates" for distribution of graduates by sponsoring agencies and sex.)

An interview guide was prepared, and approved for use in the survey. It was followed precisely in employer interviews, but in the case of graduates alone the ratings were recorded by the interviewer.

Interviews were always conducted with employers when they were present and where it was possible to interview both employer and graduate in private, this was done. This resulted in a total of fifty-six interviews, thirty-seven with employers alone, seven with graduates alone, and six with both employer and graduate.

In all instances but one, employers stated that they would be willing to hire other Skills Center graduates in the future, if given the opportunity to do so. The one employer who stated reluctance did indicate that if he were to hire a Skills Center graduate it would be through the regular routine for hiring in his business establishment. Most employers were enthusiastic about the program and the success of the graduates. Only a few of the employers had comments on the training, and these mostly concerned a need for more training or on-the-job experience, especially for diesel mechanics and auto-body work. In many cases the employer was not aware of the exact courses the graduates had taken at the Skills Center, and some were not aware the employee was a graduate of the Skills Center.

Employers acknowledged that some followups by sponsoring agencies and Skills Center personnel had been made. In the Salt Lake City area seven were by phone calls, most of which were to graduates on either STEP or OJT Programs with salaries being paid by the sponsoring agencies. In addition, five followup contacts were made in person, four in the automotive field and one to a machinist. In the Ogden area three followups were in the automotive field and one in the business field. One was made by use of the telephone, the other three in person. This small number of followups by Skills Center personnel seems to indicate a lack of serious concern for the success of the Skills Center graduates. Instead, as was reported in a conversation with the Skills Center Director, the few followups reflect heavy loads by Center personnel who do many other things leaving little time for this kind of activity. On the other hand and somewhat in contrast, both employers and graduates expressed interest toward the face-to-face contact made through the interview conducted in this followup. Both employers and graduates were anxious to talk about the Skills Center program. In no case did the employer resent his time being taken in the interview nor that of his Skills Center graduate employee.

During the interviews it was informally noted that a majority of the employers knew little or nothing about the extent of the Skills Center programs or of the objectives of the Center. Combining this observation with that rendered in the previous paragraph, it is concluded that one of the most valuable assets of this followup endeavor was that of improved public relations. This then leads to the recommendation that those responsible for Skills Center operation examine the potential of improving public relations through a positive program of personal contact as expeditiously as possible.

1. Employment status of selected graduates. As stated earlier, a total of fifty graduates of the Utah Skills Center comprised the sample for the followup being reported herein. Following is the tabulation of the employment status of each of the fifty graduates at the time of the followup in early December, 1971. In considering these data it is noted that the term retained refers to the graduate being still on the job or he left the first job for a better one; riffed refers to the company originally employing the graduate having a reduction in force, thus laying the graduate off; lost refers to the graduate having been fired or left the job for causes unknown; and never employed refers to the graduate being reported by an agency as working for a given company that had never employed the graduate.

Of the fifty persons comprising the sample of this followup, fourteen males were in auto mechanics, fifteen females were in business occupation, and five males were machinists. Other occupational classifications were represented by a frequency of less than five in each instance. It is again noted that the graduates comprising the sample for this followup were selected randomly. There is no evidence to assume that these results would be different if the whole population were to have been included in the followup study.

Table 1. Employment Status of Selected Graduates

	N	Retained		Riffed		Lost		Never Employed		Unknown	
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Salt Lake City											
MDTA males	15	5	33	3	20	6	40	1	7	-	-
MDTA females	10	8	80	-	--	2	20	-	--	-	-
WIN males	4	-	--	-	--	-	--	-	--	4	100
WIN females	5	3	60	-	--	2	40	-	--	-	--
NYC males	5	3	60	-	--	2	40	-	--	-	--
DRS females	1	1	100	-	--	-	--	-	--	-	--
Ogden											
MDTA males	6	3	50	1	17	-	--	1	17	1	17
MDTA females	1	1	100	-	--	-	--	-	--	-	--
WIN male	1	1	100	-	--	-	--	-	--	-	--
WIN females	2	1	50	1	50	-	--	-	--	-	--
TOTAL	50	26	52	5	10	12	24	2	4	5	10

2. Salaries. One part of the desired followup data was that of determining the salary being earned by the Skills Center graduates. The data presented below are for the forty graduates in the followup study for whom information regarding their salaries was furnished. It is noted that salaries were variously reported in terms of time, hours, weeks, and months. Therefore, in order to have a common base for comparison salaries were converted to a weekly basis and the nearest whole dollar.

Table 2. Salaries

	N	Average	Range
Salt Lake City			
MDTA males	13	$98	$80 - $125 + Bonus
MDTA females	5	85	76 - 90
MDTA (combined)	18	94	76 - 125 + Bonus
WIN males	4	121	100 - 148 (Union)
WIN females	4	79	70 - 91
NYC males	3	80	70 - 91
DRS females	1	81	
TOTALS	30	93	70 - 148 + Bonus
Ogden			
MDTA males	6	92	75 - 146
MDTA females	1	60	
WIN males	1	146	
WIN females	2	68	
TOTALS	10	89	60 - 146

From the preceding it can be seen that a wide range of salaries was paid to graduates of the Skills Center with the average salaries paid to men exceeding that paid to women in each instance where the two were classified solely on the basis of sex. No determination of statistical differences were calculated because of the small N, but it was observed during data collection and analysis that most of the employed male graduates were either in the auto mechanics or machinist trades while the females were predominately in the business field. Further comparisons did not seem feasible because of the lack of a common basis for such.

3. Performance and attitude. Graduates' performance and attitudes, as seen by their employers, were assessed using as descriptors, poor, fair, good, and excellent. For purposes of quantifying the responses, values of 1, 2, 3, and 4 were assigned to the respective verbal descriptors. Based on this numerical scale, a mean of 2.5 or more was considered positive.

The data, means and standard deviations for total groups, reflecting employers perceptions of performance and attitudes are presented in Table 3. No statistical treatment of these data was made, nor has an interpretation of goodness or badness been applied. What is noted, however, is the preponderance of positive positioning of reactions of employers to the several characteristics of performance and attitude that were considered.

From Table 3 it can be seen that for the Skills Center graduates from the Salt Lake City area all mean ratings of performance and attitude were positive. The strongest registration of such a position pertained to graduates showing a willingness to learn. The quality of dependability had a mean rating of 2.5, just sufficient to be classified as positive.

Table 3. Employers' Assessments of Selected Skills Center Graduates' Performance and Attitude Toward Work By Program, 1971.

	SALT LAKE CITY AREA						SKILLS CENTER NORTH			
	MDTA	WIN	NYC	DRS	TOTAL		MDTA	WIN	TOTAL	
N	25	9	5	1	40		5	2	7	
	M	M	M	M	M	SD	M	M	M	SD
Performance	2.9	2.9	2.7	1.0	2.8	.8	2.8	2.5	2.7	.7
Work habits	3.1	2.7	2.3	1.0	2.8	.9	3.0	2.5	2.9	.4
Appearance	2.7	3.1	2.3	3.0	2.8	.7	3.0	3.0	3.0	--
Cooperation	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.0	2.8	.5	3.5	2.5	3.1	.6
Social Attitude	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.8	.5	2.8	3.0	2.9	.4
Punctuality	2.7	2.7	1.7	4.0	2.7	.9	2.6	1.5	2.3	.9
Adaptability	2.9	3.0	1.7	2.0	2.8	.9	2.8	3.0	2.9	.6
Willingness to Learn	3.2	3.0	2.7	3.0	3.2	.8	3.2	3.0	3.2	.6
Desire to Work	3.1	2.9	2.0	3.0	2.9	.9	3.0	3.0	3.0	.8
Dependability	2.7	2.3	1.7	3.0	2.5	.9	3.0	2.0	2.7	.9
Loyalty	3.1	2.9	2.3	1.0	2.9	.6	3.0	3.0	3.0	.5
Pride in Accomplishments	2.8	3.0	2.0	3.0	2.8	.8	2.8	3.0	2.9	.4
Training Appropriate to Job:										
Yes	21	7	2	----	30	--	7	3	10	--
No	1	---	---	1	2	--	---	---	---	--

NOTE: Means based on rating of Poor = 1, Fair = 2, Good = 3, Excellent = 4. A rating of 2.5 or more is considered positive.

The mean ratings of attitudes toward work for the graduates of the Skills Center North who were part of the followup also resulted in willingness to learn as being the strongest, most positive. Punctuality, on the other hand, had a mean rating of 2.3, leaning slightly toward the fair position.

Table 4 contains data pertaining to assessments of performance and attitudes according to three of the types of employment in which some of the graduates were found. The limiting factor for inclusion was the small numbers represented in the variety of other occupations. Auto mechanic, machinist, and business graduates are reported upon as well as five graduates of the Salt Lake City WIN High School. Comparing the data from the previous table with Table 4, a close parallel is noted. This leads to the conclusion that the issues of performance and attitudes when considered according to occupation are not different from those when the total groups are considered.

Based on these data pertaining to performance and attitudes of Skills Center graduates, the overall program has been successful in ways other than those measured in more objective and quantifiable terms.

4. General considerations. In addition to the issues of performance and attitudes, other information was ascertained during the followup: (1) 85 percent of the graduates (thirty-five of forty-one on whom data were reported) became employed within the first two months after graduation, 12 percent (five of forty-one) three to four months after graduation, and 2 percent (one) more than four months after graduation; (2) at the time of the followup, 57 percent of the auto mechanics, 33 percent of the machinists, 73 percent of the business graduates, and 83 percent of the WIN graduates were still employed. Seven percent of the auto mechanics and 50 percent of the machinists had lost their jobs because of a reduction in force of the employer. Overall, 24 percent (ten of forty-one for whom data were reported) had lost their jobs through their own fault, 65 percent (twenty-six of forty-one) were still employed, and 10 percent (four of forty-one) had been riffed. One female graduate had become unemployed because of health reasons.

Promotions were not considered specifically. The time frame of the survey was such that the elapsed time of employment was hardly sufficient to justify promotions. There were, however, several instances of merit raises, and recognition of jobs well performed by increases in wages.

5. Quoted responses. In addition to the tallied responses reported above some employers made comments which are quoted as they provide an additional dimension of the results. It should be noted that only a few made comments and those that commented on the lack of sufficient training or experience did so concerning job fields that need a greater amount of training than that provided in the periods devoted to the field at the Skills Center.

Table 4. Employers' Assessments of Selected Skills Center Graduates' Performance and Attitude Toward Work, By Classification of Employment, and of High School Completion, Salt Lake City and Skills Center North Combined, 1971.

	Auto Mechanics		Machinist		Business		WIN HS Completion	
N	14 (males)		5 (males)		15 (female)		4 (males)	1 (female)
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Performance	2.7	.7	2.8	.4	2.8	.9	2.8	.4
Work Habits	2.6	.8	2.8	.4	2.8	.0	2.5	.9
Appearance	2.7	.7	3.0	--	3.0	.5	2.6	.5
Cooperation	3.6	.6	3.0	--	3.0	.6	2.8	.7
Social Attitude	2.8	.6	2.8	.4	2.9	.5	3.0	--
Punctuality	2.6	.9	2.4	.8	3.0	.7	2.6	1.1
Adaptability	2.8	1.0	3.2	.7	3.0	.9	2.6	.8
Willingness to Learn	3.0	.8	3.2	.7	3.3	.7	2.8	.4
Desire to Work	2.8	1.1	2.8	1.0	3.1	.8	2.6	.9
Dependability	2.6	.9	2.4	.8	3.0	.7	2.0	1.0
Loyalty	3.0	.8	2.8	.4	3.0	.6	2.6	.5
Pride in Accomplishment	2.9	.8	2.8	.8	3.0	.6	2.4	.8

NOTE: Means based on rating of Poor = 1, Fair = 2, Good = 3, Excellent = 4. A rating of 2.5 or more is considered positive.

a. Employers.

One body mechanic: "Needed more experience or training and I didn't have the time to train him." Was dismissed without prejudice.

"Needed more experience or training."

"She needs to be taught how to work on the job and with people."

"Graduates should buck-up on punctuality and dependability."

"Fired for failure to report to work." This graduate had a fine overall rating by supervisor, but he failed to comply with company rules concerning reporting for work.

"Was capable but had no desire for work."

"She had the skills necessary, but was too emotional due to family problems. She did not keep up with her work as a result."

"She had a good background in regular secretarial duties, and is doing well in the field of law secretary by studying on her own."

"She has adapted well for this business (wholesale carpets), meets people well."

"Riffed, but was recommended to EIMCO for employment."

"No matter what is taught in Skills Center, many specialized companies must train to their own work." Employer was well satisfied with mechanical training, but the company specialized in heavy duty truck springs.

"I always contact the Skills Center when mechanics are needed. The instructors always followup on their graduates and continue to help them after graduation. This is a fine exception to the general followup procedures. It is being accomplished by the automotive instructors in Ogden. They also place most of their graduates in local firms, and they enjoy a fine reputation with those firms."

b. Graduates.

"I want to specialize more to get a better job."

"STEP training was of no use; in fact, I got rusty on typing as I never did any work for which I was trained. The Employment Service only sent me to housekeeping and cleaning jobs. I finally got my own job."

"They (Hamilton) should use a more advanced book in business machines course."

"I think the program is great, it helped me to get off of relief." Several girls and a few men made this comment.

"I was well satisfied with the training. I am attending evening classes at LDS Business College and the University of Utah."

"The program was great. It permitted me to get through high school at a much faster rate than regular school. McKinley had the most thoughtful teachers."

"They need more instructors."

NOTE: Several employers informed the interviewer of vacancies that they presently have or would have during the first part of 1972. They indicated an interest in Skills Center gradutes. They were informed how to make contact with personnel at the Skills Center in order to make employment opportunities and needs known.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The general objectives established to be achieved in this evaluation were:

1. Conduct a review of related literature.

2. Examine the Manpower Development and Training Act to ascertain the manner in which the provisions of the Act have been accommodated in the Utah Skills Center

3. With the cooperation and assistance of the Skills Center Director, translate, where necessary, the Center's objectives into measurable terms and decide upon method and calendar for the evaluative processes.

4. Develop, devise, or otherwise identify success criteria which will provide an indication of the effectiveness of the program at the Skills Center.

5. Conduct the activities of (a) data collection employing the instruments and techniques developed and agreed upon as being appropriate for that purpose, (b) data analysis and interpretation, and (c) reporting the findings.

As displayed in Appendix A, a review of the literature relating to manpower programs and training was conducted. Information from the materials perused contributed to the development of instruments and techniques used in the study, especially in the preparation of training program objectives to be assessed, and in the methods of measurement.

Pages 4-12 display information acquired and examined in the course of ascertaining the manner and extent to which provisions of the MDTA were accommodated in the Utah Skills Center. An example is cited: The first comment of Skills Center compliance found on page 5 suggests that in order to completely satisfy the stated requirement, a reorganization of staff is necessary. Similar statements follow throughout the section.

In Appendix B the measurable objectives developed with the cooperation of Skills Center staff, translated from the general Center objectives are displayed. Following portions of the Appendix contain facsimiles of instruments developed and used to gather data to assess achievement of the objectives. These objectives additionally were used as success criteria presumed to indicate effectiveness of the Skills Center program.

The above four objectives and this document itself comprise the achievement of the fifth objective of this project.

The vast majority of the data acquired during the course of the evaluation strongly support the need for the existence of the Utah Skills Center. The data reveal favorable results have been accomplished especially in light of the problems encountered in giving birth to such a diversely segmented operation as the Center. Where there are rough spots or problem areas, as pointed out in certain parts of this evaluation report, it is felt that the administrators and others responsible for the Center are highly capable of reaching amicable and workable solutions and in an amiable fashion. The strong positive attitudes and dedication of staff suggest that problems encountered, though often severe, are not insurmountable.

The one overriding recommendation derived after an extensive review of the data acquired and experiences encountered during the entire evaluation process is that the Utah Skills Center be perpetuated. In making this recommendation, the evaluation team is fully cognizant of the fact that many aspects of operation should be improved, but given the opportunity to do so, a better Skills Center can be made to operate. The reactions to suggestions informally rendered, as personnel in the Skills Center were met and worked with throughout the evaluation period, further supports this recommendation and contention. In the same light, the respective sections of this report can constitute guidelines for consideration during the ensuing months and years of operation of the Utah Skills Center.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Review of Literature and Selected Research (Annotated)

Esbensen, Thorwald. Writing Instructional Objectives, undated paper. 5 pages, Discussion of the proper way to express measurable objectives for instructional purposes.

Mager, Robert F. Preparing Instructional Objectives, Fearon Publishers, Palo Alto, California, 1964. 59 pages, Paper Back, Discussion of measurable objectives and exercises in their preparation.

New York State Education Department, Division of Special Occupational Services. A Study of Manpower Development and Training Act Programs in New York State, November 1964. 189 pages, A study of the success of the programs in New York State from a demographic approach.

Olympus Research Corporation, Salt Lake City, Utah. Evaluation of Manpower and Training Skills Centers, Final Summary Report, February 15, 1971. An evaluation of the Skills Centers of the United States with recommendations for improvement.

UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation. Products for Improving Educational Evaluation, Fifth Annual Report to the U.S. Office of Education, September 1970. 16 pages, A discussion of the procedures for evaluation educational institutions, programs, and methodology and theory.

Unidentified. Performance Criteria and Curriculum Development Workshop, Session No. 4. Paper, 11 pages, A general discussion of writing measurable objectives with various forms designed to aid in their development.

Utah Manpower Planning Council Staff. Human Resource Center, Evaluation and Recommendations, March 1971. 65 pages, A study of the terminees of the Salt Lake Human Resources Center for the period March 1, 1970 to December 31, 1970. The study considers the success of the terminees based on demographics. Conclusions and recommendations are made to improve the retention of terminees in the work world.

Utah State Board for Vocational-Technical Education. Some Concepts of Learning Levels and Measurable Objectives, 1969-70. 23 pages, A study of the various domains of measurable objectives, and a discussion of how they are applied.

State Plan Part I, II, and III, 1970-71. 200 pages. The plan for conducting vocational and technical education for the state during 1970-71 with projections for the next four years.

Status of Career Development Programs. February 1971. 16 pages, A report on the career development programs in selecting high schools prepared to fulfill a requirement of the Utah State Legislature.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research. Clerical and Typing Skills of High School Students Trained in "MOE" Compared to Rural and Urban High School Students Trained in Regular Class Room Techniques, October, 1969. 53 pages. An inconclusive study of the advantages of the "MOE" system of teaching typing.

Utah Project "Follow-up," December 1970. 47 pages A study to develop procedures for following up the success of the terminees from the various vocational and technical educational programs. Complete with an instruction and code book for such follow-up studies.

Guide Lines for the Planning and Development of Skills Centers, June 1970. (Received 28 September 1971). 46 pages. Guide lines of the Federal Agencies to determine the need for Skills Centers, the locations and populations served, the manner of making annual evaluations, and the basis of establishing priorities in the use of Skills Centers in the CAMPS planning process.

Various papers on Measurable Objectives, furnished by Dr. Austin G. Loveless, Professor, Industrial and Technical Education Department, Utah State University, Logan, Utah.

APPENDIX B

I. Overall Objectives

A. Following referral by outreach counselors, agencies or institutions, 35 to 50 percent of the students who are referred for training at the Skills Center North will be able to complete the training with success.

B. After completing training, the following minimum percentages will be obtained:

1. Fifty percent of the successful trainees will acquire permanent employment.

2. Ten percent of the successful trainees will seek higher education. (Post secondary)

3. Ten percent of the successful trainees will require Step training, work experience or additional help.

4. Thirteen percent of the trainees will be placed through NABS-JOBS or OJT contracts.

5. Seventeen percent of those who complete training may not succeed due to motivation, attitude, attendance, or other reasons.

C. The students who enter the Adult Basic Education or GED training will be able to:

1. Improve skills by at least three grades (if ninth grade or lower) and pass a test showing this improvement within six months.

2. Take the GED test and obtain a passing score after being recommended for testing. (Maximum preparation time is nine months.)

3. Pass a screening test for selection into skills training with a minimum score of 70 percent.

D. The skills training clusters will be evaluated according to the State Articulation Guides, and the overall objectives cited previously.

E. The institutional clusters not covered by articulated guides will be required to meet a 60 percent successful completion standard.

F. In addition to the State Guide, the clerical section will screen graduates in the attached categories.

1. Upon completion of the Typewriting course the student will demonstrate proficiency of speed and control on the typewriter to the point that no less than 40 wpm and no more than one error per minute is achieved and complete all necessary problems to compete for a job.

2. Upon completion of the Business English course, the student will know the essentials of grammar, usage, and style, spelling and use of business terms; the principles and techniques of writing various types of business letters and reports and memos; and the ability to use it skillfully in the business world.

3. Upon completion of the Business Machines course, the student will be able to identify and list the functions of the keys and motor parts of the ten-key adding and listing machine with 90 percent accuracy. The student will be able to operate the machine at a speed of 120 digits per minute with no more than four errors and solve 35 problems in multiplication and division both by the step method and the automatic key control with no more than four errors in a 50-minute time limit.

4. Upon completion of the Filing course, the student will be able to set up a filing system according to the alphabetic filing method. The file would contain no less than ten guide cards and the student will be able to set up the system in 25 minutes.

5. Upon completion of the Shorthand course, the student will develop ability and increase efficiency in taking shorthand at no less than 80 wpm, and be able to produce mailable letters.

6. Upon completion of Hyspeed Longhand, the student will develop ability and increase accuracy in taking dictation at no less than 80 wpm and be able to produce mailable letters.

7. Upon completion of the Dictation and Transcribing Machines course, the student will develop skill and gain experience in the transcription of letters and manuscripts from recording belts and tapes with 100 percent accuracy.

G. The attached attitudinal evaluation and criterion objectives are submitted in non-behavioral form and should be included for a meaningful evaluation.

I. Attitudinal Evaluation

A. The Skills Center Policy Committee members will feel they have:

1. The decision-making authority they need.

2. A suitable composition of committee members, that the group represents all interests that should be represented.

3. Adequate time to study problems before making decisions.

4. Access to all information they need for decision making.

B. Each of the agencies (DRS, ESA, WIN, Family Services, Ogden CAA, Davis CAA) feels that:

1. The Skills Center provided an adequate service for their referrals.

2. A workable linkage had been developed between themselves and the Skills Center.

3. Higher levels of authority allowed them necessary freedoms.

C. The Students (Skills Center) feel they received:

1. The kind of education and training they wanted, that the time and effort were well spent.

2. Adequate assistance with child care needs when necessary.

3. Adequate assistance with transportation when necessary.

4. Adequate counseling when necessary.

5. Opportunities for jobs after and/or during training.

II. Performance Evaluation (in question form)

A. Did Ogden and Davis County CAAs refer clients to the Skills Center? How many?

B. Did these agencies make known to their communities the services and programs of the Skills Center? How? To how many people?

C. Did CAA job development projects coordinate with the Skills Center and Employment Security? How?

D. Did CAA staff provide outreach counseling and follow-up on request of the Skills Center? In what ways? How, if any, were the requests made?

E. Did Employment Security provide job development services for the Skills Center? How? Did this service differ from the usual job development that is provided by ES? How many jobs were developed?

F. Did Employment Security provide job placement for Skills Center clients? For how many?

G. Did Employment Security provide follow-up services for Skills Center clients placed on jobs? For how long? How was this accomplished? What work was done with the clients? With the employers?

H. Did Employment Security provide a full-time staff member to serve as a liaison and to correlate total ES resources with the Skills Center? Who is this person? What are the person's functions?

I. Did ES maintain at least 70 MDTA slots to be served in the Skills Center? Any more than 70?

J. Did ES maintain at least 40 WIN slots to be served by the Skills Center on a buy-in basis? Any more than 40?

K. Did ES provide on-site vocational counsling at the Skills Center for ES sponsored referrals? For other referrals? How many?

L. Did the Division of Rehabilitation Services provide counseling for the referrals to the Skills Center? How? What was accomplished? Was there additional counseling provided for non-DRS referrals? For how many? What was the nature of the counseling? How were these clients identified?

M. Did DRS provide on-site psychological testing at the Skills Center? For how many persons? What types of instruments were used?

N. Did DRS maintain at least 40 slots to be served at the Skills Center on a buy-in basis? Any more than 40?

O. Did DRS provide any staff to work with the Skills Center? Who were these persons? What tasks did they perform?

P. Did Family Services provide the services of group therapists to conduct regular group counseling sessions as needed?

APPENDIX C

UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SKILLS CENTER EVALUATION

Attitude Assessment

Please check on the appropriate line:

_____Student
_____Teacher
_____Counselor
_____Member Advisory Group
_____Director
_____Referral Agency
_____Administration

	Agree	Partially Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Not Apply
1. The physical facilities are adequate.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. My assignment is a drudgery.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. The student-teacher ratio is too high.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. The counseling services are satisfactory.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. I am wasting my time in the Skills Center assignment.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Problems of great consequence which have arisen remain unsolved.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. (Not related to students.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. The student council has rendered useful service.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. Materials and books have been adequate.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. The course offerings of the Skills Center are appropriate.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. There is compatability among staff members.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. I made a mistake by affiliating with the Skills Center.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
13. The Skills Center program is a success	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
14. Students trained at the Skills Center are well enough prepared to acquire and hold jobs.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
15. If I had it to do again, I would choose to be a part of the Skills Center program.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SKILLS CENTER EVALUATION

Quantifiable Data

1. How many students were referred to the Center from each of the following sources? How many students were accepted into the program?

	Referred		Accepted	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
MDTA	____	____	____	____
WIN	____	____	____	____
NYC	____	____	____	____
CAA	____	____	____	____
DRS	____	____	____	____
BIA	____	____	____	____
High schools	____	____	____	____
Model cities	____	____	____	____
Other	____	____	____	____

If other, identify source of referral: _____

2. Of the students enrolled, what was the last grade completed? How many in each grade?

____ 6th or less	____ 9th	____ 12th
____ 7th	____ 10th	____ Other
____ 8th	____ 11th	

3. How many students were of each age at time of acceptance into the program?

____ 16	____ 19	____ 26-30
____ 17	____ 20	____ 31 and over
____ 18	____ 21-25	

4. At the time of acceptance into the program, how many were:

Married? ____ Single? ____ Widowed? ____ Employed? ____
Divorced? ____ Separated? ____ Welfare recipients? ____ Unemployed? ____

5. How many students in the program are?

White? ____ Negro? ____ Spanish-Amer.? ____ Indian? ____ Oriental? ____ Other? ____

6. How many students in the program are:

Veterans? ____ Job Corps graduates? ____ Handicapped? ____

7. How many students accepted appointment to the Center but did not remain at least one month? _____ (Note: Do not count these persons as students.)

   List the causes most frequently given for departure from the program:

8. What was the average waiting time between acceptance and actual starting of the program? _____

   What were the causes, if any, of delays?

9. What criteria was used to determine if a student had completed his program? Be Specific.

10. Of the students who remained in the program more than one month but did not complete the program, how many:

    Left for employment in related fields? ____ Total dropouts: ____
    Left for employment in unrelated fields? ____ Major reasons other than listed:
    Left to attend other schools? ____
    If female, were married? ____
    Entered military service? ____

11. How many students from the following areas were provided counseling assistance and what was the average amount of time spent in counseling?

	Number of students	Average time (in minutes)
Distributive education	____	____
Office occupations	____	____
Health occupations	____	____
Food service	____	____
Trade and industry	____	____

12. What is the average instructional cost of training per student per year? $____

13. What is the composition of the staff at the Center in terms of number, age, and race? Also, years of experience as teachers or counselors.

	Number	20-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61+	Wh	Ne	SpAm	Ind	Ori	Other
Full-time teachers												
Part-time teachers												
Counselors												
Administrators												
Other:												

Experience: Full-time teachers	0-3	4-10	11-20	21-30	31+
Part-time teachers					
Counselors					
Administrators					
Other					

14.

	How many students completed program according to stated criteria	What was the time to complete program?			How many trained students have been placed in jobs within 3 mos.		How many have entered military service?	How many have enrolled in a regular sec school/ post sec		If female how many have been married?
		Min	Max	Ave	Rel	Unrel		Post	Sec	
Food Service										
Auto Mech										
Auto body										
Diesel Mech										
Welding										
Shthand										
Typing										
Bus. machines										
Record keepng										
Carpentry										
Plumbing										
Electricity										
Electronics										
Drafting										
Adult Ed.										
G.E.D.										
Other- Specify										

15. Of the students placed on jobs, how many have <u>not</u> lost their jobs through their own failures or shortcomings for at least six months or are presently on the job?

16. Of the students who were placed on jobs, how many were referred by the OES?

17. How many hours of in-service training was provided the staff during the past 12 months? _____

18. Is a student government organization function? _____ If yes, describe using the back side of this page.

19. List names of people and organizations serving on the Advisory Council along with the number of hours per person per month that are spent in service to the Skills Center.

Name	Organization	Hours per month

20. How many students are using the guides or course outlines which contain measurable objectives? _____

21. Check the adequacy of the kinds of support provided permitting regular attendance:

	Adequate	Partially	Inadequate
Transportation			
Baby care			
Stipends			
Home counseling			
Home economics advice			
Budgeting advice			
Health care			

22. Place an asterisk (*) in front of each of the items of #14 which represent programs <u>not</u> compatible with the job market.

UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SKILLS CENTER EVALUATION

Opinions of Importance and Effectiveness

Consider each of the items below and respond according to the degree of importance and the degree of effectiveness related to the Skills Center operation.

IMPORTANCE					OBJECTIVES	EFFECTIVENESS			
High	Mod-erate	Low	None			High	Mod-erate	Low	None
___	___	___	___	1.	The Skills Center will accept all referrals within established quotas.	___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___	2.	All courses will be open-ended.	___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___	3.	Seventy-five percent(75%) of the students referred to the Center will successfully complete their program.	___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___	4.	Fifty percent(50%) of the successful trainees will acquire permanent employment.	___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___	5.	Ten percent (10%) of the successful trainees will seek higher education.	___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___	6.	Thirteen percent (13%) of the successful trainees will be placed through NABS-JOBS or OJ contracts.	___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___	7.	Improve skills by at least 3 grades (if 9th grade or lower) and pass a test showing this improvement within six months.	___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___	8.	Take a G.E.D. test and obtain a passing score after being recommended for testing. (Maximum preparation time is 9 months.)	___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___	9.	Pass a screening test for selection into skill training with a minimum score of 70%.	___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___	10.	Community participation will be through an advisory council.	___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___	11.	A strong student government will be established to work with the staff and faculty.	___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___	12.	All referral agencies, the Advisory Committee and staff and faculty will maintain close liaison.	___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___	13.	Employment services will maintain an in-house counselor at each Center.	___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___	14.	Adequate and appropriate facilities will be made available at the center.	___	___	___	___

UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
SKILLS CENTER EVALUATION

Interview Guide

1. Male _____ Female _____ OR Teacher _____ Counselor _____ Administrator _____ Other _____

2. Are students aware of individual course objectives? Yes _____ No _____

3. Are students aware of program objectives? Yes _____ No _____

4. Do students feel that the knowledge of objectives allows them to proceed at their own pace? Yes _____ No _____

5. What kinds of problems deter students from proceeding at their own pace? Use back of this paper or another to record responses from interview.

6. Do students feel their courses are related to their objectives? Yes _____ No _____ Problems: _____

7. Do teachers feel that measurable objectives help students to achieve? Yes _____ No _____ Problems: _____

8. What changes in the program would you recommend?

9. What are the strenths of the program?

10. What are the weaknesses of the program?

11. Suggestions for specific additional programs:

12. Other comments.

APPENDIX D

Quantitative Data

Table 1. Number of Students Referred to and Accepted in Utah Skills Center and Source of Referral, January - September, 1971

Agency-Source	WIN Referred		Hamilton Referred		Skills Center North Referred		Total Referred	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
MDTA	--	--	50	42	59	35	109	77
WIN	59	70	56	47	66	58	181	175
NYC	--	--	38	36	--	--	38	36
CAA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
DRS	2	2	70	30	37	35	109	67
BIA	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
High Schools	--	--	18	--	--	--	18	--
Model Cities	--	--	15	10	--	--	15	10
Other	2	3	3	--	--	--	5	3
TOTAL	63	75	250	165	162	128	475	368

Note: All who were referred were accepted at each location of Skills Center.

Table 2. Distribution of Students Enrolled in Utah Skills Center According to Last Grade Completed, January - September, 1971

Grade Completed	WIN	Hamilton	Skills Center North	Total
Sixth or less	2	9	30	41
Seventh	10	13	15	38
Eighth	14	22	40	76
Ninth	31	46	70	147
Tenth	38	65	100	203
Eleventh	25	34	30	89
Twelfth (Grad.)	18	90	5	113
Unreported	--	136	--	136
TOTAL	138	415	290	843

Table 3. Distribution of Students Enrolled In Utah Skills Center According to Age at Time of Acceptance into Program January - September, 1971

Age	WIN	Hamilton	Skills Center North	Total
16	11	19	2	32
17	6	64	10	80
18	6	60	20	86
19	12	31	10	53
20	9	25	20	54
21-25	46	79	80	205
26-30	21	53	80	154
31 and over	27	84	40	151
Unreported	--	--	28	28
TOTAL	138	415	290	843

Table 4. Marital, Employment, Welfare, Military, Job Corps, and Physically Handicapped Status of Students Enrolled in Utah Skills Center, January - September, 1971

Status	WIN	Hamilton	Skills Center North	Total
Married	24	96	Unreported	120
Divorced	37	56	Unreported	93
Single	29	126	Unreported	155
Separated	16	--	Unreported	16
Widowed	--	4	Unreported	4
Employed	2	--	Unreported	2
Unemployed	138	415	Unreported	553
Welfare Recipients	138	96	Unreported	234
Veterans	23	21	35	79
Job Corps Graduates	--	--	4	4
Handicapped Physical	--	--	30	30

Table 5. Racial Distribution of Students in Utah Skills Center, January - September, 1971

Race	WIN	Hamilton	Skills Center North	Total
White	117	176	178	471
Negro	2	10	18	30
Spanish-American	17	72	95	184
Indian	--	5	2	7
Oriental	--	3	--	3
Other	--	1	3	4
TOTAL	136*	267*	296*	699*

* From report

Table 6. Enrollees in Utah Skills Center Who Did Not Remain at Least One Month, and Most Frequently Reported Reason for Leaving January - September, 1971

	WIN	Hamilton	Skills Center North	Total
	22	26	24	72
	Non-attendance or Non-adjustment	Obtained employment	Personal Problems	
	Job Hunting	Poor Attendance		
	Family Problems			

Table 7. Reasons for Students' Terminating Utah Skills Center Enrollment After One Month and Prior to Completion of Program January - September, 1971

Reason for Leaving	WIN	Hamilton	Skills Center North
Employment			
Related field	--	4	Not reported
Unrelated field	4	15	
Other schools	9	10	
Military	1	6	
Marriage (if female)	1	11	
Moved	2	--	
Job Hunting	6	--	
Non-attendance and non-adjustment	11	--	
Medical or illness	4	--	
Other		200	
TOTAL	38	246	

Table 8. Age, Race, and Experience of Utah Skills Center Staff, January - September, 1971

AGE: Classification	N	AGE 20-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61+
Teachers						
full-time	8, 18, 5	4, 7, -	1, 8, -	1, 3, -	- - -	2. 0, -
part time	0, 2, 8	0, 2, -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
Counselors	0, 3, 1	0, 1, -	0, 1, -	0, 1, -	- - -	- - -
Administrators	1, 2, 3	0, 2, -	- - -	1, 0, -	- - -	- - -
Other	1, 6, 0	0, 2, -	0, 3, -	0, 1, -	- - -	1, 0, -
RWEWA	0, 5, 0	0, 3, -	0, 2, -	- - -	- - -	- - -

Note: Age distribution not reported for Skills Center North. First number = WIN, Second = Hamilton, Third = Skills Center North.

RACE: Classification	White	Negro	Spanish American	Indian	Oriental	Other
Teachers						
full-time	8, 13, 2	0, 1, 0	0, 3, 2	- - -	0, 1, 1	- - -
part-time	0, 2, 5	- - -	0, 0, 3	- - -	- - -	- - -
Counselors	0, 3, 1	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
Administrators	0, 1, 0	0, 0, 1	1, 1, 1	- - -	0, 0, 1	- - -
Other	1, 6, 0	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -
RWEWA	0, 4, 0	0, 1, 0	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -

Note: First number = WIN, second = Hamilton, third = Skills Center North

EXPERIENCE: Classification	Experience in Years 0 - 3	4 - 10	11 - 20	21 - 30	31+
Teachers					
full-time	1, 6, 2	4, 10, 3	1, 2, 0	1, 0, 0	1, 0, 0
part-time	0, 2, 4	0, 0, 4	- - -	- - -	- - -
Counselors	0, 2, 0	0, 1, 1	- - -	- - -	- - -
Administrators	0, 1, 1	1, 1, 2	- - -	- - -	- - -
Other	0, 5, 0	0, 1, 0	- - -	- - -	1, 0, 0
RWEWA	0, 2, 0	0, 3, 0	- - -	- - -	- - -

APPENDIX E

Attitudinal Assessments

Table 9. Attitudes of Students, Staffs, and Referral Agencies or Advisory Committees Toward Activities, Programs, and Conditions in Utah Skills Center Locations and Comparisons of Differences Between Respective Groups and Locations, 1971.

	WIN			Hamilton			Skills Center North		
	Stu	Sta	RA or AdCom	Stu	Sta	RA or AdCom	Stu	Sta	P Com & RefAg Comb
N	82	10	9	117	13	12	84	15	17
1. The physical facilities are adequate.									
MWV*	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.1	2.3	2.7	3.3	2.5
Stu-Sta:	Not Sig.			No Dif.			.05		
Stu-RA	Not Sig.			.05			Not Sig.		
Sta-RA:	No Dif.			.05			.05		

WIN Students - Hamilton Students:	Not Sig.
WIN Students - Skills Center North:	.05
Hamilton Students - Skills Center North:	.05
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:	Not Sig.
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	Not Sig.
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	Not Sig.

* MWV: Arithmetical mean of responses based on continuum between four and one wherein Agree = 4, Partially Agree = 3, No Opinion = 2, and Disagree = 1.

Table 9 Continued.

	WIN			Hamilton			Skills Center North		
	Stu	Sta	RA or AdCom	Stu	Sta	RA or AdCom	Stu	Sta	P Com & Ref Agen Combined
N	82	10	9	117	13	12	84	15	17
2. My assignment is a drudgery.									
MWV	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.6	1.0	1.0	1.6	1.2	2.3
Stu-Sta:	.05			.05			Not Sig.		
Stu-RA:	.05			.05			Not Sig.		
Staff-RA:	No Dif.			No Dif.			.05		

WIN Students-Hamilton Students:	Not Sig.
WIN Students-Skills Center North:	Not Sig.
Hamilton Students-Skills Center North:	No Dif.
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:	No Dif.
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	Not Sig.
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	Not Sig.

3. The student-teacher ratio is too high.									
MWV	1.5	1.2	1.9	1.8	2.2	2.3	2.1	1.6	3.2
Stu-Sta:	.05			Not Sig.			Not Sig.		
Stu-RA:	Not Sig.			Not Sig.			.05		
Staff-RA:	Not Sig.			Not Sig.			.05		

WIN Students-Hamilton Students:	.05
WIN Students-Skills Center North:	.05
Hamilton Students-Skills Center North:	Not Sig.
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:	.05
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	Not Sig.
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	Not Sig.

Table 9 Continued.

	WIN			Hamilton			Skills Center North		
	Stu	Sta	RA or AdCom	Stu	Sta	RA or AdCom	Stu	Sta	P Com & Ref Agen Combined
N	82	10	9	117	13	12	84	15	17
4. The counseling services are satisfactory.									
MWV	3.3	2.7	3.6	3.3	2.3	2.4	3.6	2.1	2.1
Stu-Sta:		Not Sig.			.05			.05	
Stu-RA:		Not Sig.			.05			.05	
Staff-RA:		.05			Not Sig.			Not Sig.	
WIN Students-Hamilton Students:						No Dif.			
WIN Students-Skills Center North:						Not Sig.			
Hamilton Students-Skills Center North:						Not Sig.			
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:						Not Sig.			
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:						Not Sig.			
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:						Not Sig.			
5. I am wasting my time in the Skills Center assignment.									
MWV	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.6
Stu-Sta:		.05			Not Sig.			No Dif.	
Stu-RA:		No Dif.			.05			Not Sig.	
Staff-RA:		Not Sig.			.05			Not Sig.	
WIN Students-Hamilton Students:						Not Sig.			
WIN Students-Skills Center North:						Not Sig.			
Hamilton Students-Skills Center North:						Not Sig.			
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:						Not Sig.			
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:						Not Sig.			
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:						Not Sig.			
6. Problems of great consequence which have arisen remain unsolved.									
MWV	1.9	1.6	2.0	2.1	1.9	3.1	2.1	2.1	2.7
Stu-Sta:		Not Sig.			Not Sig.			No Dif.	
Stu-RA:		Not Sig.			.05			Not Sig.	
Staff-RA:		Not Sig.			.05			Not Sig.	
WIN Students-Hamilton Students:						Not Sig.			
WIN Students-Skills Center North:						Not Sig.			
Hamilton Students-Skills Center North:						No Dif.			
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:						Not Sig.			
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:						Not Sig.			
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:						Not Sig.			

Table 9 Continued.

	WIN			Hamilton			Skills Center North		
	Stu	Sta	RA or AdCom	Stu	Sta	RA or AdCom	Stu	Sta	P Com & Ref Agen Combined
N	82	10	9	117	13	12	84	15	17

7. I could work effectively with several more students than at present. (Not related to students)

MWV	N/A	2.0	2.2	N/A	1.5	N/A	N/A	2.1	N/A
Stu-Sta:		---			---			---	
Stu-RA:		---			---			---	
Staff-RA:		Not Sig.			---			---	

WIN Students-Hamilton Students:	N/A
WIN Students-Skills Center North:	N/A
Hamilton Students-Skills Center North:	N/A
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:	Not Sig.
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	Not Sig.
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	Not Sig.

8. The student council has rendered useful service.

MWV	2.7	2.9	1.6	2.7	1.7	2.9	2.4	2.5	3.1
Stu-Sta:		Not Sig.			.05			Not Sig.	
Stu-RA:		.05			Not Sig.			.05	
Staff-RA:		.05			.05			Not Sig.	

WIN Students-Hamilton Students:	No Dif.
WIN Students-Skills Center North:	Not Sig.
Hamilton Students-Skills Center North:	Not Sig.
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:	.05
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	Not Sig.
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	.05

9. Materials and books have been adequate.

MWV:	1.8	2.3	3.2	2.4	2.0	1.9	3.5	3.3	2.4
Stu-Sta:		Not Sig.			Not Sig.			Not Sig.	
Stu-RA:		.05			Not Sig.			.05	
Staff-RA:		Not Sig.			Not Sig.			.05	

WIN Students-Hamilton Students:	.05
WIN Students-Skills Center North:	.05
Hamilton Students-Skills Center North:	.05
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:	Not Sig.
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	.05
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	.05

Table 9 Continued.

	WIN			Hamilton			Skills Center North		
	Stu	Sta	RA or AdCom	Stu	Sta	RA or AdCom	Stu	Sta	P Com & Ref Agen Combined
N	82	10	9	117	13	12	84	15	17
10. The course offerings of the Skills Center are appropriate.									
MWV	3.0	3.6	3.3	3.3	.32	3.3	3.6	3.2	2.8
Stu-Sta:		Not Sig.			Not Sig.			Not Sig.	
Stu-RA:		Not Sig.			No Dif.			.05	
Staff-RA:		Not Sig.			Not Sig.			Not Sig.	
WIN Students-Hamilton Students:					.05				
WIN Students-Skills Center North:					.05				
Hamilton Students-Skills Center North:					Not Sig.				
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:					Not Sig.				
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:					Not Sig.				
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:					No Dif.				
11. There is compatability among staff members.									
MWV	3.6	3.9	3.3	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.3	.35	2.9
Stu-Sta:		Not Sig.			Not Sig.			Not Sig.	
Stu-RA:		Not Sig.			No Dif.			Not Sig.	
Staff-RA:		Not Sig.			Not Sig.			Not Sig.	
WIN Students-Hamilton Students:					.05				
WIN Students-Skills Center North:					Not Sig.				
Hamilton Student-Skills Center North:					Not Sig.				
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:					.05				
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:					Not Sig.				
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:					Not Sig.				
12. I made a mistake by affiliating with the Skills Center.									
MWV	1.3	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.0	1.2	1.0	1.2
Stu-Sta:		.05			Not Sig.			Not Sig.	
Stu-RA:		Not Sig.			Not Sig.			No Dif.	
Staff-RA:		Not Sig.			Not Sig.			Not Sig.	
WIN Students-Hamilton Students:					Not Sig.				
WIN Students-Skills Center North:					Not Sig.				
Hamilton Students-Skills Center North:					Not Sig.				
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:					Not Sig.				
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:					Not Sig.				
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:					Not Sig.				

Table 9 Continued.

	WIN			Hamilton			Skills Center North		
	Stu	Sta	RA or AdCom	Stu	Sta	RA or AdCom	Stu	Sta	P Com & Ref Ag Comb.
N	82	10	9	117	13	12	84	15	17
13. The Skills Center program is a success.									
MWV	3.2	3.8	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.6	3.4	2.9
Stu-Sta:	.05			Not Sig.			Not Sig.		
Stu-RA:	Not Sig.			Not Sig.			.05		
Staff-RA:	.05			Not Sig.			Not Sig.		
WIN Students-Hamilton Students:	Not Sig.								
WIN Students-Skills Center North:	.05								
Hamilton Students-Skills Center North:	Not Sig.								
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:	Not Sig.								
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	Not Sig.								
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	Not Sig.								
14. Students trained at the Skills Center are well enough prepared to acquire and hold jobs.									
MWV	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.9	3.1	2.7	3.1	3.3	2.6
Stu-Sta:	Not Sig.			Not Sig.			Not Sig.		
Stu-RA:	Not Sig.			Not Sig.			.05		
Staff-RA:	No Dif.			Not Sig.			Not Sig.		
WIN Students-Hamilton Students:	Not Sig.								
WIN Students-Skills Center North:	Not Sig.								
Hamilton Students-Skills Center North:	Not Sig.								
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:	Not Sig.								
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	Not Sig.								
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	Not Sig.								
15. If I had it to do again, I would choose to be a part of the Skills Center program.									
MWV	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.5
Stu-Sta:	.05			Not Sig.			Not Sig.		
Stu-RA:	.05			Not Sig.			Not Sig.		
Staff-RA:	No Dif.			Not Sig.			Not Sig.		
WIN Students-Hamilton Students:	Not Sig.								
WIN Students-Skills Center North:	Not Sig.								
Hamilton Students-Skills Center North:	Not Sig.								
WIN Staff-Hamilton Staff:	Not Sig.								
WIN Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	Not Sig.								
Hamilton Staff-Skills Center North Staff:	No Dif.								

Table 10. Comparisons of Importance of Objectives and Effectiveness of Fulfillment Related to Utah Skills Center Operation as Perceived by Staffs and Referral Agencies or Advisory Committees of Respective Center Locations, 1971.

	WIN		Hamilton		Skills Center North	
	Staff	Ref.Ag.	Staff	Ref.Ag.	Staff	Ref.Ag.
N	10	9	13	12	15	17
1. The Skills Center will accept all referrals within established quotas.						
IMP. MWV*	3.8	3.7	2.6	3.7	3.6	3.6
EFF. MWV*	3.6	3.2	2.7	3.4	3.4	2.9
Importance to Effectiveness	Not Sig.	.05	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	.05
2. All courses will be open-ended.						
IMP. MWV	3.4	3.7	2.9	3.7	3.8	3.7
EFF. MWV	3.2	3.2	2.8	3.6	3.4	3.4
Importance to Effectiveness	Not Sig.	.05	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.
3. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the students referred to the Center will successfully complete their program.						
IMP. MWV	3.4	3.8	3.0	3.7	3.6	3.5
EFF. MWV	3.4	2.8	3.0	2.6	2.9	2.1
Importance to Effectiveness	No Dif.	.05	No Dif.	.05	.05	.05
4. Fifty (50) percent of the successful trainees will acquire permanent employment.						
IMP. MWV	3.8	3.4	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.6
EFF. MWV	3.5	2.6	3.0	2.9	3.4	2.7
Importance to Effectiveness	Not Sig.	.05	Not Sig.	.05	Not Sig.	.05

*MWV: Arithmetical mean of responses based on continuum between four and one wherein High = 4, Moderate = 3, Low = 2, and None = 1.

Table 10. Continued.

	WIN		Hamilton		Skills Center North	
	Staff	Ref.Ag.	Staff	Ref.Ag.	Staff	Ref.Ag.
N	10	9	13	12	15	17
5. Ten (10) percent of the successful trainees will seek higher education.						
IMP MWV	3.5	3.2	2.8	3.1	3.4	3.4
EFF MWV	3.4	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.4	2.5
Importance to Effectiveness	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	No Dif.	.05
6. Thirteen (13) percent of the successful trainees will be placed through NABS-JOBS or OJT contracts.						
IMP MWV	3.7	3.0	2.6	3.1	3.8	2.9
EFF MWV	3.3	2.7	2.8	2.8	3.4	1.8
Importance to Effectiveness	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	.05
7. Improve skills by at least three grades (if ninth grade or lower) and pass a test showing this improvement within six months.						
IMP MWV	3.5	3.8	3.1	3.3	3.3	3.0
EFF MWV	3.0	3.2	3.1	2.8	3.3	2.3
Importance to Effectiveness	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	No Dif.	.05	No Dif.	.05
8. Take a GED test and obtain a passing score after being recommended for testing. (Maximum preparation time is nine months.)						
IMP MWV	3.7	3.8	3.2	3.2	3.3	2.9
EFF MWV	3.6	3.2	3.1	2.7	3.2	2.5
Importance to Effectiveness	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.
9. Pass a screening test for selection into skill training with a minimum score of 70 percent.						
IMP MWV	3.5	3.3	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.3
EFF MWV	3.6	3.1	3.1	2.5	3.0	1.8
Importance to Effectiveness	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	No Dif.	No Dif.	Not Sig.

Table 10. Continued.

	WIN		Hamilton		Skills Center North	
	Staff	Ref.Ag.	Staff	Ref.Ag.	Staff	Ref.Ag.
N	10	9	13	12	15	17
10. Community participation will be through an advisory council.						
IMP MWV EFF MWV	3.3 3.0	3.3 2.4	2.4 2.0	3.3 2.9	3.5 3.2	3.5 3.3
Importance to Effectiveness	Not Sig.	.05	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.
11. A strong student government will be established to work with the staff and faculty.						
IMP MWV EFF MWV	3.9 3.4	3.5 2.8	3.1 3.3	3.3 3.3	3.6 3.5	3.6 2.5
Importance to Effectiveness	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	No Dif.	Not Sig.	.05
12. All referral agencies, the Advisory Committee and staff and faculty will maintain close liaison.						
IMP MWV EFF MWV	3.9 3.4	4.0 2.9	3.8 2.9	3.8 3.2	3.8 3.4	3.9 2.5
Importance to Effectiveness	Not Sig.	.05	.05	.05	Not Sig.	.05
13. Employment services will maintain an in-house counselor at each center.						
IMP MWV EFF MWV	3.8 3.0	3.5 2.9	3.4 2.9	3.5 2.9	3.7 3.3	3.5 2.7
Importance to Effectiveness	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	.05	Not Sig.	.05
14. Adequate and appropriate facilities will be made available at the center.						
IMP MWV EFF MWV	3.9 3.0	3.8 3.2	3.9 3.3	3.9 3.6	4.0 3.2	3.9 2.4
Importance to Effectiveness	.05	.05	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	.05

APPENDIX F

MDTA SKILLS CENTER EVALUATION

Employer Interview Guide

Name _____ Sponsor _____

Vocational Training _____ Date Graduated _____

Date employed _____ Date terminated _____ (if applicable)

Employed by _____ (firm) _____ (address)

Employed as _____ Salary _____

Supervisory _____ Position _____

Estimate of performance of graduate:	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Graduate's Appearance	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Cooperation	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Social Attitude	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Punctuality	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Adaptability	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Willingness to learn	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Work habits	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Desire to work	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Dependability	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Loyalty to employer	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Pride in accomplishments	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent

Was training appropriate to job? Yes No Comment: _____

What additional training is recommended? _____

Would employer hire other Skills Center graduates? Yes No If no, why?

Follow-up counseling: By agency _____ By Skills Center _____

Comments: